erty be stated unless it is an essential element of the crime. An appendix to the bill contains 100 specimen forms of indictments for various offenses, drawn in accordance with the principle of brevity and simplicity. The proposed form of indictment for murder, for example, is as follows: "That A. B., on the ..... day of ....., 19...., of his malice aforethought, with a certain ax, did assault and beat (shoot, stab, choke, poison, etc.) C. D. with intent to murder him, and by said assault and beating (shooting, etc.) did kill and murder said C. D." The general purpose of the bill is admirable. It is framed by men who are actively engaged in the prosecution of criminals and who know the shortcomings of the present system. The objects at which it aims certainly should commend themselves to the legislature.

J. W. G.

THE CHURCH AND THE CRIME PROBLEM.

Recently there has been a remarkable awakening of popular interest in the crime problem. This interest has found expression not only in the discussion of measures for the prevention of crime and for dealing with criminals in a more rational manner, but in organized movements for the betterment of the criminal law and procedure. The flood of discussion in the newspapers, popular magazines and law periodicals has been quite unprecedented. Hardly any other topic has found a place on the programs of so many different and unrelated organizations. Bar associations, learned societies, scientific bodies, civic organizations and even the labor unions have all taken a hand in the discussion of the problem in some form or another. Lately religious bodies have begun to join in the agitation for more effective methods of combating crime and punishing criminals. For several years the State Baptist Convention of Georgia has had a standing committee on criminal law reform, at the head of which is a distinguished member of the Atlanta bar. The committee has taken its duty seriously and has presented two reports to the convention, in both of which it dwells upon the increase of crime in this country; the causes which, in its opinion, are responsible therefor, and the remedies which should be applied. We publish on another page of the JOURNAL a summary of the resolutions adopted by the convention at its recent annual meeting, in November last.

The activity of all these organizations affords further evidence of the widespread dissatisfaction with the administration of the criminal law in certain parts of this country. Their diagnoses of the causes are not always correct, their criticisms of the criminal law and its machinery of administration are not always just, nor are all the remedies which they propose practicable or effective. But of one thing we are certain:

No such widespread discontent, no such outpouring of criticism, would be possible were there not real causes for it. Some of the evils complained of, it will readily be granted, are wholly imaginary, but many of them are real and cannot be ignored. We need the coöperation of the learned societies, the scientific bodies, the religious denominations and all other organizations that are capable of aiding the cause, whether it be in the inculcation of higher standards of respect for law, the diagnoses of causes, the collection of data bearing upon the conditions which must be dealt with, the investigation of results obtained elsewhere, the remedies to be applied, and so on. The bar associations in many states are earnestly considering schemes of reform, and everywhere there is an evident desire among the better class of lawyers to remove the cause of the popular discontent. Intelligent and constructive coöperation of all organizations should, therefore, and doubtless will, be welcomed.

J. W. G.

TWO CALIFORNIA JURISTS ON LAW REFORM.

The JOURNAL has recently had the privilege of presenting to its readers two admirable papers on law reform by two of the most distinguished jurists of California, Mr. Justice Sloss, of the Supreme Court, and Judge Lawlor, of the Superior Court. The defects of our present procedure and the remedies, as pointed out in these two papers, deserve the thoughtful consideration of the bench and bar, to say nothing of the legislatures, from whom much of the relief must come, if it comes at all. Mr. Justice Sloss frankly admits that there is much force in the criticism that the entire scheme of procedure is too cumbersome and inadequate and that improvement may and should be had. In the second place, he says, the objection that the law in its present condition gives the accused too great an advantage as against the state is well founded. In the third place, the delays with which prosecutions are disposed of is an evil the seriousness of which cannot be over-estimated. Both he and Judge Lawlor dwell upon the evil practice of reversing convictions justly obtained, upon errors which do not affect the merits of issues. Where there has been a painstaking and laborious trial of the facts before a court and a jury, says Justice Sloss, and the result has been the establishment of guilt, the entire proceeding has been reduced to a futility if the judgment is reversed upon some ground which has no direct relation to the ultimate question of guilt or innocence. The practice of considering on appeal, says Judge Lawlor, virtually every question that is raised reduces the final authority of the trial court to a minimum, involves voluminous records, delays justice and fosters lawlessness. The verdict of the jury and the judgment of the trial court